

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The specification has been amended to include identification of reference number "53" which was indeed omitted in the application as filed as noted in the Office Action.
2. The Office Action required an election of one species from among six, each species corresponding to a figure. The applicant makes an election of species III – Fig.3. The applicant believes that the claims as amended which read on this species are claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, and 25.
3. The applicant does not believe that species I – Fig. 1 is a distinct species from species II – Fig. 2. The differences in surface roughening (cross hatching versus dimples) do not effect the functionality of the invention, and the degree of flaring was not intended to show a functional difference.
4. The applicant argues that claim 1 is a generic claim with respect to species II, III, IV, and V that, as amended, are written in dependent form from claim 1.

<u>Species</u>	<u>Claims that read on species</u>
II	1,2,3,5,6,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16,17,22,23,24,25
III	1,3,5,6,8,10,13,16,17,22,23,24,25
IV	1,4,6,7,8,10,13,16,17,22,23,24,25
V	1, 3, 5,6,8,10,13,16,17,18,22,23,24,25
VI	19,20 and 21

Applicant respectfully requests examination of species II, IV, and V in addition to the elected species III if a generic claim is allowable. Applicant also requests examination of species VI if it could be done without extensive additional effort by the examiner.

5. The applicant has amended the claims to make species II, IV, and V read clearly as dependent clauses, and to repair typos in claim 19.
6. Applicant wishes to point out that an IDS was submitted on June 9, 2004 which is not included in the IFW. A copy is enclosed for the examiner's convenience.

If there are any questions please contact the undersigned attorney at (510)785-8070 or facsimile (510)372-2778.

Respectfully Submitted,



Howard E. Lebowitz
Registration No. 44,864
Attorney of Record